## REMARKS

Claim 1-21 are pending. The Final Action dated June 10, 2004 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been amended in this Response. Claims 11-21 have been withdrawn from consideration in a previous Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for assertedly being indefinite.

Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites that "female conductive connection elements on an electrically isolated plug [...] having an insulating open-ended sheath surrounding at least a portion of each of said female conductive elements." As amended, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and that the rejection has been overcome.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for assertedly being indefinite. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is overcome.

Claim 6 as now amended more particularly refers to the "at least two adjacent sockets." As amended, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and that the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Admitted Prior Art Fig. 1-2 ("Prior Art"), or alternatively, in view of the Prior Art and U.S. Patent No. 4,952,398 by Samejima et al. ("Samejima") or U.S. Patent No. 6,132,233 by Fukuda ("Fukuda"). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claim, these rejections are submitted to be overcome.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, "an engagement member disposed on at a side of least one of said peripheral walls and having an engagement edge that is at least configured to engage a locking tab of said electrically isolated plug, wherein at least a portion of said engagement edge and at least a portion of each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals are located at apexes of a non-oblique triangle in a plane orthogonal to each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals." Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, FIGURES 3 and 4 of the original Application.

Specifically, neither the Prior Art, Samejima, nor Fukuda teach, disclose, or suggest, singularly or in combination, the use of "an engagement member disposed on at a side of least one of said peripheral walls and having an engagement edge that is at least configured to engage a locking tab of said electrically isolated plug, wherein at least a portion of said engagement edge and at least a portion of each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals are located at apexes of a non-oblique triangle in a plane orthogonal to each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals" on the body of a positive temperature coefficient of resistance current limiting device, in combination with all the other elements of Claim 1.

Applicants acknowledge that wire connection terminals often have snap connections of other configurations to prevent unintended disconnection in other contexts. However, As pointed out in the specification of the present invention, in Pars. 2-3, for example, a connection for a positive temperature coefficient of resistance current limiting assembly (PTCR) must meet size and location restraints not applicable to snap connectors having wires at each end that are used in other contexts. For example, typical snap connectors having wires at each end, can be easily handled and moved around for access for connection and disconnection, with two hands. By contrast,

connections for PTCR's mounted *in situ* on equipment must operate in a vibration-prone environment, and yet be easy to assemble *in situ* on the equipment in a crowded location, such mounted on an electric motor at the back of an appliance, usually with one hand, and often only by feel. For these reasons, designs employed by snap connectors having wires at each end do not solve the problems encountered with PTCR's.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest placing an engagement member where at least a portion of said engagement edge and at least a portion of each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals are located at apexes of a non-oblique triangle in a plane orthogonal to each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals on the body of a positive temperature coefficient of resistance current limiting device, in combination with the other limitations of Claim 1. By positioning the engagement edge as an apex of a non-oblique triangle, as in the present invention of Claim 1, a more efficient connection can be formed that easy to assembly, and yet is stout and better able to secure a locking tab than would be the case with either Samejima, nor Fukuda, even if either or both were to be combined, hypothetically, with the Admitted Prior Art.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the Prior Art, or alternatively, in view of the Prior Art and Samejima or Fukuda be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 2-5 and 7 also be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the Prior Art, or alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Prior Art and U.S. Patent No. 6,459,590 by Malnati ("Malnati"). Moreover, Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the U.S. Patent No. 3,914,727 by Fabricius ("Fabricius") and Fukuda. Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are submitted to be overcome because of the amendments to Claim 1 stated above.

Specifically, neither the Prior Art, Malnati, Fabricius, nor Fukuda teach, disclose, or suggest, singularly or in combination, the use of "an engagement member disposed on at a side of least one of said peripheral walls and having an engagement edge that is at least configured to engage a locking tab of said electrically isolated plug, wherein at least a portion of said engagement edge and at least a portion of each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals are located at apexes of a non-oblique triangle in a plane orthogonal to each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals" in combination with all the other elements of Claim 1. Applicants acknowledge that wire connection terminals often have snap connections of other configurations to prevent unintended disconnection in other contexts, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest placing an engagement edge that is at least configured to engage a locking tab of said electrically isolated plug, wherein at least a portion of said engagement edge and at least a portion of each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals are located at apexes of a non-oblique triangle in a plane orthogonal to each upwardly extending axis of each of said male conductive terminals. By having the engageable edge as an apex of a non-oblique triangle

as in the present invention of Claim 1, a more efficient connection can be formed that is stout and better able to secure a locking tab than would be the case with either any of the wire terminals snap connectors of the prior art of record, even if the even combined, hypothetically, with the Admitted Prior Art and/or Malnati.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the Prior Art, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Prior Art and Malnati, and under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Fabricius and Fukuda be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claim 2 depends on and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the dependent Claim 2 also be withdrawn.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Prior Art and Malnati. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is submitted to be overcome.

Claim 6 depends on and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the dependent Claim 6 also be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the Prior Art, or alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Prior Art and Samejima or Fukuda, and further

in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,324 by Segler et al. ("Segler"). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are submitted to be overcome.

Claims 8 and 9 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 8 and 9 also be withdrawn.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-10.

Applicants have included a check in the amount of $936.00 to cover the fee of $110.00 for a one month extension of time, $36.00 to cover the fee for two additional claims in excess of 20, and the fee of $790.00 to cover the fee for filing a Request for Continued Examination, which is submitted herewith. In the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Theodore F. Shiells
Reg. No. 31,569

Dated: 10/11/04
CARR LLP
670 Founder's Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3032
Fax: (214) 760-3003